

PATENT

Docket No: ST00025USU (SIRF.123-US-U1)

Serial No.: 09/967,136

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending and Applicant has amended claim 1. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added in this response. Applicant also acknowledges that the Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejections and issued the current rejections in view of the Applicants previous amendments.

35 U.S.C §103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo et al. (U.S. 6,370,208) in view of Underbrink (U.S. 6,650,879). In the Non-final Office Action, the Examiner stated that "Kuo discloses...dispreading operation [that] is performed once for each equivalent combination (abstract). The ability to derive correlator outputs for multiple codes from these terms allows redundant computations to be eliminated...".

But, in amended claim 1, Applicant is not claiming simply reducing the number of mathematical operations. Rather, Applicant is claiming "using the table during the correlation process to determine when a locally generated pseudorandom code and the incoming pseudorandom code received at the GPS receiver are correlated where the table accounts for signal phase inversion." Thus, Applicant is using a table that accounts for the signal phase inversion. This is supported on page 10 of the application lines 3-6 and page 11, lines 1-3.

The Kuo et al. reference fails to show or describe accounting for the signal phase inversion in their calculations. Further the Kuo et al. reference also fails to show or describe a table being used during the correlation process. It appears that Kuo et al. is using matrix processing and registers rather than a table a claimed by Applicants.

PATENT
Docket No: ST00025USU (SIRF.123-US-U1)
Serial No.: 09/967,136

For the above reasons, the combination of the Kuo et al. reference and the Underbrink reference when combined, fails to teach or describe all of Applicant's claim elements for independent claim 1. Also if elements are missing when the references are combined, there can be no suggestion or motivation to combine the references and no likelihood of success when the references are combined. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance along with claims 2-8 that depend from independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks and amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, which such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
THE ECLIPSE GROUP

By: 

Gregory B. Gulliver, Reg. #44,138
Attorney for Assignee
Registration No. 44,138
The Eclipse Group, LLP
100 Tristate-International, Suite 128
Lincolnshire, IL 60069
Phone: (847) 282-3551
Fax: (312) 264-2387

Customer No. 34408